



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO: Members of the State Board of Education

FROM: Jeremy M. Hughes, Ph.D.  
Acting Superintendent

DATE: February 2, 2005

**SUBJ: REPORTING OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE  
INDICATORS**

Attached is a December 27, 2004 report, discussed at the January 11, 2005 State Board of Education meeting. The report presented several options for calculating the School Performance Indicators (school self-assessment) portion of the EducationYES!/AYP school report cards that will be issued this summer.

Staff recommended the Board's approval of "Option 2," depicted on page 2 of the report. Subsequent Board discussion seemed to support this recommendation but formal Board approval was not requested until the February 8 meeting, to allow educators in the field time to react and respond.

Since the January 11 SBE meeting, there has been very little reaction from the field except for a major suggestion that Option 2, which was originally worded as

*Option 2 – If "F" or "D" for Achievement Grade, limit composite grade increase to one grade category.*

be reworded to read:

*Option 2 – In calculating a school's composite grade, the inclusion of the School Performance Indicator grade may not serve to increase the composite grade by more than one grade category.*

The rewording in effect makes the policy apply across the board, to all schools, not just those receiving an "F" or "D" for achievement.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

The Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability ran a simulation, applying this proposed policy change to the data used to compute the original Option 2. It was discovered that there was no change in the composite grades of the schools that had received “A,” “B,” or “C” in achievement when their Indicator grades were included. In other words, no A, B, or C achievement school’s composite grade was raised more than one grade category to begin with, and thus the impact figures listed on page 2 of the report would remain the same with the approval of the proposed change.

Recommended Action: Approval of the proposal that, in the school report cards to be issued in 2005, the inclusion of the grade for the School Performance Indicators may not serve to increase a school’s composite grade by more than one grade category.



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



THOMAS D. WATKINS, JR.  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

**To:** State Board of Education  
**From:** Tom Watkins  
**Date:** December 27, 2004  
**Subject:** Plans for the Reporting of School Performance Indicator Information in 2005

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the State Board of Education an update on current plans to report School Performance Indicator information in Spring, 2005 for inclusion in the school report cards that will be issued later in the school year for the Education YES! state accreditation system. As has already been indicated, a revision of the School Performance Indicators is currently under way. Plans call for the indicators themselves to be revised in early January, for a field review of these to take place in February, and for staff to develop measures for the new indicators by March, so that a field test of the indicators can occur in a small number of schools in April, and for revised measures to be available for use in October-November, 2005 for the 2005-2006 school report cards.

Because new measures (and new indicators) will likely not be approved for use this school year, staff has made plans to use the current Indicators one last time. Staff has also made plans to modify the use of these Indicators in the 2004-2005 report cards. These modifications were presented in the item presented to the State Board of Education at the October 12 meeting; a copy of this item is attached. Staff is proposing to change how the School Performance Indicators will be combined with the MEAP Status and Change categories (which staff is proposing not to change this year.)

Specifically, staff is proposing to reduce the likelihood that a school can receive low achievement scores and yet rate itself at a high level on the School Performance Indicators and thus receive a passing grade and be accredited. Three options were presented at the October 12 meeting. They are:

- Option 1 Temporarily adjust the weight the indicators carry in the report card, from the current 33% to 25%, 20%, or 15%. This would increase the weight carried by the Achievement grade to 75%, 80%, and 85%.
- Option 2 If a school receives an "F" or a "D" in the overall Achievement report card grade, a higher grade for the School Performance Indicators would only allow the Achievement grade to be increased by one grade level category (that is, from "F" to "D," or from "D" to "C"). (Note: this option would be similar, but in reverse, to the revision the State Board of Education approved earlier for the Achievement "Change" grade.)

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • HERBERT S. MOYER – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • JOHN C. AUSTIN – TREASURER  
MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

**Option 3** If a school received an "F" or a "D" in the overall Achievement report card grade, a higher grade for the School Performance Indicators would not allow the Achievement grade to be any higher than a "C."

**Option 4** If a school does not make AYP, the indicator score and grade are ignored and the composite grade is based on the achievement grade.

Data from the 2004 Report Card was used to simulate the impact of several options proposed for weighting and reporting of the Indicator scores and grades for the 2005 Report Card. For each option the distribution of composite letter grades is compared with the 2004 composite grade distribution, and with other options.

**Option 1** – Temporarily adjust the weighting that the Indicators carry in the composite grade

**Option 1a** – 75% Achievement; 25% Indicators;

**Option 1b** – 80% Achievement; 20% Indicators;

**Option 1c** – 85% Achievement; 15% Indicators

Grade

Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
772	22.3%	654	18.9%	591	17.1%	536	15.5%
1622	46.9%	1458	42.2%	1383	40.0%	1318	38.1%
896	25.9%	1093	31.6%	1157	33.4%	1218	35.2%
154	4.5%	233	6.7%	295	8.5%	323	9.3%
15	0.4%	21	0.6%	33	1.0%	64	1.9%

**Option 2** – If "F" or "D" for Achievement Grade; limit composite grade increase to one grade category;

**Option 3** - If "F" or "D" for Achievement Grade; limit composite grade to "C";

Grade	Current 67/33		Option 2 F to D or D to C		Option 3 F or D to C	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A	772	22.3%	772	22.3%	772	22.3%
B	1622	46.9%	1621	46.9%	1622	46.9%
C	896	25.9%	841	24.3%	896	25.9%
D/Alert	154	4.5%	210	6.1%	154	4.5%
Unaccredited	15	0.4%	15	0.4%	15	0.4%

Option 2 has no impact on "A"s nor on the number of unaccredited schools. It does result in fewer "C"s and more "D" grades. Option 3 has no impact at all.

**Option 4** – Composite Grade is the Achievement Grade if the school does not make AYP

Grade	Current 67/33		Option 4 67/33 IF AYP	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>A</b>	772	22.3%	772	22.3%
<b>B</b>	1622	46.9%	1509	43.6%
<b>C</b>	896	25.9%	694	20.1%
<b>D/Alert</b>	154	4.5%	298	8.6%
<b>Unaccredited</b>	15	0.4%	186	5.4%

Option 4 yields a larger number of unaccredited schools than any of the other options, while having limited impact at the higher end of the scale. The number of "A" schools stays the same as under the current calculation and the number of "B" schools decreases slightly.

After considerable discussion, staff is recommending that the Board approve the use of option 2 for use in the 2005 School Report Card. We are suggesting Option 2 because it will preserve the current weighting of the achievement and indicator components of Education YES!

With approval of the State Board of Education, staff of the Accreditation/Accountability Unit of the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability will inform school districts of this change and will implement it in time for the 2005 School Report Card to be publicly released in August, 2005. We will re-examine this issue when the revised School Performance Indicators are brought to the State Board of Education for approval during the summer. Hence, we seek approval for this modification for only the 2004-2005 school year at this time.